

## Poultry Science Journal

ISSN: 2345-6604 (Print), 2345-6566 (Online) http://psj.gau.ac.ir DOI: 10.22069/psj.2021.18880.1673



# Effects of Low-Protein Diets Supplemented with Essential Amino Acids on Growth Performance, Meat Quality, and Nitrogen Retention in Growing Japanese Quails

Mehdi Abdolhosseinzadeh<sup>1</sup> Mohamad Salarmoini<sup>1</sup> Mohsen Afsharmanesh<sup>1</sup> Reza Ghanbarpur<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Animal Science, College of Agriculture, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran <sup>2</sup>Department of Microbiology, College of Veterinary, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran <sup>3</sup>Department of Basic Sciences, College of Veterinary, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran

Poultry Science Journal 2021, 9(2): 167-178

Keywords Meat pH Performance Cooking loss Japanese quail Meat water holding capacity

**Corresponding author** Mohamad Salarmoini salarmoini@uk.ac.ir

Article history Received: February 22, 2021 Revised: July 17, 2021 Accepted: July 29, 2021

## Abstract

One experiment was carried out to investigate the effect of low crude protein (CP) diets supplemented with crystalline essential amino acids (EAAs) on growth performance, meat quality, and nitrogen retention in Japanese quails reared from 1 to 35 days of age. A total of 840 unsexed one-day-old quail chicks were used in a completely randomized design consisting of seven treatments with six replicates and 20 birds in each. In addition to the control diet, two negative control diets were also adjusted to contain 10 and 20% lower CP than the control (LP10 and LP20 diets, respectively). The EAAs/CP ratio was similar to that of the control diet. Also, four rations supplemented with amino acids were formulated to contain 10% (LP10+EAAs10 and LP20+EAAs10) or 20% (LP10+EAAs20 and LP20+EAAs20) higher EAAs than LP10 and LP20. Crude protein digestibility was determined using the total collection method at 21 and 35 d of age. After slaughtering at 21 and 35 d of age, whole-breast meats were dissected out to determine meat quality indices. During 1 - 21d of age, 10 or 20% reduction in CP significantly decreased body weight gain and increased feed conversion ratio; however, amino acid supplementation significantly improved body weight gain and feed conversion ratio (P < 0.05). During 1- 35 d of age, reduction of CP to 20% led to decreased body weight gain in EAAs supplemented and un-supplemented diets. Dietary treatments did not have any significant effect on the breast meat quality variables except for pH. At 35d of age, 20% reduction in dietary CP significantly reduced nitrogen retention percentage. Overall, a 10% reduction in dietary CP without EAAs supplementation had no adverse effect on the growth performance of Japanese quails during the 1 to 35d of age.

### Introduction

Protein is a costly ingredient in poultry diets. On the one hand, insufficient levels of amino acids can lead to lower performance, because deficiency of amino acids restricts protein synthesis (Lima *et al.*, 2016). On the other hand, the over-consumption of protein is not economical since it leads to the degradation of surplus amino acids (Perry *et al.*, 2004). Poultry excreta and its nitrogenous compounds resulting in nitrite or nitrate contamination of water, and

subsequently increases air pollution due to the release of ammonia (Vieira and Angel, 2012). Therefore, one of the most important strategies to reduce environmental pollution is to reduce nitrogen excretion in poultry manure. Partial replacement of dietary protein during the growing and laying phases by appropriate amino acids has been the issue of many experiments in recent decades (Si *et al.*, 2004; Abudabos and Aljumaah, 2012; Belloir *et al.*, 2017;

Please cite this article as Mehdi Abdolhosseinzadeh, Mohamad Salarmoini, Mohsen Afsharmanesh, Reza Ghanbarpur & Neda Eskandarzade. 2021. Effects of Low-Protein Diets Supplemented with Essential Amino Acids on Growth Performance, Meat Quality, and Nitrogen Retention in Growing Japanese Qualis. Poult. Sci. J. 9(2): 167-178.

© 2021 PSJ. All Rights Reserved

Saraiva *et al.*, 2020). However, there are restrictions on how much intact protein can be substituted by free amino acids without affecting growth performance (Si et *al.*, 2004; Baker, 2009; Liu *et al.*, 2021).

The CP content in the diet of growing quails ranges from 22 to 27% in the different reports (NRC, 1994; Baldini *et al.*, 1995; Shrivastava and Panda, 1999; Rostagno *et al.*, 2011). In most of these investigations, just one diet has been suggested for all of the growing phases. Besides, it is uncertain that protein recommendations by NRC (1994) as a basic reference are appropriate for modern quail strains.

It seems that more accurate estimates of amino acid requirements in quails would allow to partially replace dietary CP with industrial amino acids in crystalline form. This replacement could improve the amino acid balance, avoid excess oxidation, reduce metabolic costs and emission of pollutants into the environment and unfavorable aroma in aviculture (Lemme, 2003; Ayasan et al., 2009; Vieira and Angel, 2012). Ayasan and Okan (2010) and Wen et al. (2017) suggested that with supplementation of synthetic amino acids, it is feasible to formulate lowprotein diets without any detrimental effect on performance and carcass traits in broilers and quails. Taheri and Alvani (2020) showed that lower dietary protein concentration without any reduction in EAAs concentration reduced mortality and improved European Poultry Efficiency Factor without any negative effects on feed conversion ratio, weight gain and carcass characteristics of broilers.

Nevertheless, data on the CP and EAAs requirements of quails during different growing phases are very limited. Therefore, in the present study, we examined the effects of low CP diets supplemented with essential amino acids on growth performance, carcass characteristics, meat quality and nitrogen retention in Japanese quail.

### **Materials and Methods**

## Bird management and experimental design

All procedures were confirmed by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee of the Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman (approval number: IR.UK.VETMED.REC.1400.008). A total of 840 unsexed one-day-old Japanese quails were used in a completely randomized experimental design, distributed into seven treatments with six replicates of 20 birds each and reared for 35 days. The average initial weight of quails was  $9.22 \pm 0.21$ g. Chicks were placed in wire cages with dimensions of  $100 \times 50$  cm. The mean initial body weight was similar among all pens. Throughout the experiment, chicks were reared under a 24h lighting program and standard temperature regimen, 38°C during 1 to 2 d of age and gradually decreased until reaching 25°C at 23d of age.

Before diet formulation, the feed ingredients were analyzed using a near-infrared instrument at Degussa Evonik, Iran. The experiment was conducted using a 2-phase feeding program (1-21 and 22-35 d). The diets were isoenergetic, with the CP and EAAs (including lysine, methionine, cysteine, threonine, and isoleucine) contents of the control diet formulated according to Silva and Costa (2009). Two negative control diets were formulated to contain 10 and 20% lower CP than the control diet (LP10 and LP20 diets, respectively), but EAAs was held at a constant ratio to CP for obtaining the same ratio in the two diets. Also, four amino acid-supplemented diets were formulated to supply 10% (LP10+EAAs10 and LP20+EAAs10) or 20% (LP10+EAAs20 and LP20+EAAs20) higher EAAs than LP10 and LP20 diets (Tables 1 and 2). Feed and water were available ad-libitum during the study.

#### Performance and carcass characteristics

The body weight gain (BWG), feed intake (FI), and feed conversion ratio (FCR) were recorded weekly. At 21 and 35 d of age, two quails (one male and one female) from each replication were randomly selected and weighed individually before slaughtering. The quails were deprived of feed for four hours and then slaughtered by severing the jugular vein. The quails were skinned, and wingtips eliminated. The weight of the major parts, including the thighs, breast abdominal fat, liver, heart, gizzard, proventriculus, and intestine, were recorded and expressed as a percentage of the live body weight (BW).

#### Meat quality

After slaughtering the birds at 21 and 35 d of age, whole breast meat from two quails (one male and one female) per replicate was dissected out and stored in nylon bags at 4°C for meat quality analysis (i.e., pH, cooking loss, dripping loss, and water holding capacity).

The pH of the breast meat was measured according to Jang *et al.* (2008). Five grams of raw breast meat was homogenized with 25 mL of distilled water and then filtered. Finally, the pH was measured with a pH meter (knick-766 laboratory pH meter) at room temperature ( $22\pm2^{\circ}C$ ).

For measuring water holding capacity (WHC), 1 g of the meats was placed on a tissue paper inside a tube and centrifuged for 4 min at  $1500 \times \text{g}$ . The samples were then dehydrated at 70 °C for 24 h. WHC was calculated according to this formula: [(weight after centrifugation–weight after drying)/ initial weight] × 100 (Castellini *et al.*, 2002).

#### Mehdi Abdolhosseinzadeh et al., 2021

Table 1. Ingredients and nutrient composition of the experimental diets (1 to 21 d, as-fed basis).

Control 51.57 33.21 7.17 4.50 0.50 0.98 0.76 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25 0.11	LP10 55.61 33.86 3.37 3.49 0.80 0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.25	LP20 57.70 32.32 0.48 5.21 1.50 1.01 0.75 0.35	LP10+ EAAs10 55.37 33.81 2.93 3.75 0.89 0.99 0.75	LP20+ EAAs10 57.74 32.08 0.19 5.38 1.50 1.01	LP10+ EAAs20 55.14 33.75 2.46 4.03 0.96 0.90	LP20+ EAAs2 60.45 29.47 1.05 4.83 0.62
33.21 7.17 4.50 0.50 0.98 0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	33.86 3.37 3.49 0.80 0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	32.32 0.48 5.21 1.50 1.01 0.75 0.35	33.81 2.93 3.75 0.89 0.99	32.08 0.19 5.38 1.50 1.01	33.75 2.46 4.03 0.96	29.47 1.05 4.83
7.17 4.50 0.50 0.98 0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	3.37 3.49 0.80 0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	0.48 5.21 1.50 1.01 0.75 0.35	2.93 3.75 0.89 0.99	0.19 5.38 1.50 1.01	2.46 4.03 0.96	1.05 4.83
4.50 0.50 0.98 0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	3.49 0.80 0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	5.21 1.50 1.01 0.75 0.35	3.75 0.89 0.99	5.38 1.50 1.01	4.03 0.96	4.83
0.50 0.98 0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	0.80 0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	1.50 1.01 0.75 0.35	0.89 0.99	1.50 1.01	0.96	
0.98 0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	0.99 0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	1.01 0.75 0.35	0.99	1.01		0.62
0.76 0.35 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	0.75 0.35 0.25 0.25	0.75 0.35			0.00	
0.35 0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	0.35 0.25 0.25	0.35	0.75		0.99	1.03
0.25 0.25 0.10 0.25	0.25 0.25		0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75
0.25 0.10 0.25	0.25	0.25	0.35	0.35	0.35	0.35
0.10 0.25		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
0.10 0.25		0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25
0.25	0.09	0.09	0.18	0.16	0.26	0.25
	0.11	0.03	0.26	0.16	0.39	0.34
	0.08	0.06	0.17	0.14	0.26	0.23
0	0	0	0.05	0.04	0.15	0.13
0	0	0 0	0	0	0.01	0
			-	-		
2900	2900	2900	2900	2900	2900	2900
						20
						1.14
						0.52
						0.79
						0.83
						0.85
						0.82
						0.60
						0.30
						0.25
						0.86
						0.14
						22182
25.2	22.4	20.2	22.8	19.8	22.6	20.15
	1.08	0.93	1.20	1.06	1.29	1.16
				0.44		0.53
				0.70		0.78
						0.85
0.93	0.82	0.75	0.90	0.79	0.97	0.87
1.34				1.20	1.30	1.14
						0.20
						1.54
						0.81
						0.86
	0.53	0.49	0.52	0.07	0.20	0.00
	$\begin{array}{c} 25\\ 1.19\\ 0.47\\ 0.80\\ 0.87\\ 0.92\\ 0.99\\ 0.60\\ 0.30\\ 0.25\\ 0.92\\ 0.14\\ 43380\\ \hline \\ 25.2\\ 1.21\\ 0.46\\ 0.78\\ 0.87\\ 0.93\\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+ EAAs10 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20.

<sup>2</sup>Vitamin premix provided the followings per kilogram of diet: vitamin A, 12000 IU, cholecalciferol, 5000 IU, vitamin E, 45 IU, vitamin K<sub>3</sub>, 2.4 mg, thiamine, 2.6 mg, riboflavin, 6.6 mg, pantothenic acid, 25 mg, niacin, 55 mg, choline chloride, 500 mg, biotin, 0.1 mg, folic acid, 1.5 mg, pyridoxine 5.5 mg, vitamin  $B_{12}$ ,0.015 mg, BHT, 1 mg,

<sup>3</sup>Mineral premix provide the followings per kilogram of diet: iron, 50 mg, zinc, 85 mg, manganese, 90 mg, iodine, 1 mg, copper, 10 mg, selenium, 0.25 mg. <sup>4</sup>Amino acid analysis was done by Degussa Evonik (Iran).

For cooking loss determination, meat samples of 1 cm<sup>3</sup> were cut from each breast muscle and weighed (W<sub>1</sub>). Then, the samples were cooked at 85 °C for 10 min and reweighed (W<sub>2</sub>). The following equation was used to calculate cooking loss: Cooking loss =  $100 \times [(W_1-W_2)/W_1]$  (Bertrama *et al.*, 2003).

For estimation of the dripping loss, each breast

meat sample was weighed and put into a cotton bag, and transferred into a plastic bag, which was completely sealed and kept in a refrigerator at 4 °C for 24 h. After 24 h, the meat sample was reweighted. The dripping loss was computed as the percentage of weight loss over the initial sample weight (Christensen, 2003).



Table 2. Ingredients and nutrient composition of the experimental diets (22 to 35 d, as-fed basis).

	Treatments <sup>1</sup>									
Ingredient (%)	Control	LP10	LP20	LP10+E AAs10	LP20+ EAAs10	LP10+ EAAs20	LP20+ EAAs20			
Corn (CP=7.78%)	56.74	62.22	69.70	62.80	70.23	62.12	69.07			
Soybean meal										
(CP=43.60%)	36.05	32.43	26.09	31.71	25.43	29.82	25.18			
Corn gluten meal(CP=75.87%)	1.93	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.60	1.35	0.55			
Soybean oil	2.74	2.23	1.02	2.06	0.87	2.28	1.27			
Dicalcium phosphate	0.73	0.77	0.83	0.78	0.83	0.80	0.84			
Calcium carbonate	.63	0.64	0.65	0.64	0.65	0.64	0.64			
Filler(sand)	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0.80			
NaCl	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36			
Vitamin premix <sup>2</sup>	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25			
Mineral premix <sup>3</sup>	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25			
DL-Met 99 (%)	0.14	0.11	0.08	0.19	0.15	0.25	0.20			
L-Lys HCl 78.5 (%)	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.17	0.20	0.33	0.29			
L-Thr 98 (%)	0.13	0.11	0.1	0.19	0.17	0.28	0.24			
L-Ile 98 (%)	0.15	0.11	0.1	0.17	0.01	0.07	0.06			
Composition	0	0	Ŭ	0	0.01	0107	0.000			
AME <sub>n</sub> (kcal/kg)	3050	3050	3050	3050	3050	3050	3050			
CP (%)	22	19.8	17.6	19.8	17.6	19.8	17.6			
Digestible Lys (%)	1.05	0.94	0.84	1.04	0.92	1.12	0.99			
Digestible Met (%)	0.45	0.39	0.34	0.46	0.40	0.53	0.45			
DigestibleMet+Cys (%)	0.74	0.66	0.59	0.73	0.65	0.79	0.69			
Digestible Thr (%)	0.82	0.74	0.65	0.81	0.72	0.87	0.77			
Digestible Ile (%)	0.82	0.74	0.65	0.73	0.65	0.79	0.69			
Digestible Val (%)	0.94	0.81	0.70	0.81	0.00	0.78	0.74			
Calcium (%)	0.50	0.50	0.70	0.50	0.70	0.50	0.50			
Available phosphorus (%)	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25			
Chloride (%)	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25			
Potassium (%)	0.92	0.25	0.23	0.90	0.25	0.92	0.86			
Sodium (%)	0.12	0.89	0.92	0.14	0.89	0.14	0.14			
Diet cost: Rials/kg of diet	41700	39510	37440	40050	46560	139920	125490			
Composition analysis <sup>4</sup>	41700	57510	57770	40050	40500	137720	125470			
CP (%)	22.15	19.6	17.7	19.75	17.6	20.0	17.75			
Digestible Lys (%)	1.03	0.93	0.82	1.06	0.95	1.13	1.01			
Digestible Met (%)	0.47	0.39	0.33	0.47	0.41	0.55	0.46			
Digestible Met+Cys (%)	0.75	0.67	0.58	0.71	0.67	0.80	0.71			
Digestible Thr (%)	0.84	0.07	0.64	0.82	0.74	0.88	0.71			
Digestible Ile (%)	0.83	0.75	0.66	0.72	0.66	0.80	0.68			
Digestible Arg (%)	1.30	1.19	1.02	1.17	1.00	1.12	0.99			
Digestible Trp (%)	0.23	0.21	0.17	0.20	0.17	0.19	0.17			
Digestible Leu (%)	1.76	1.55	1.43	1.54	1.42	1.56	1.39			
Digestible Val (%)	0.92	0.83	0.74	0.82	0.73	0.81	0.72			
Digestible Phe (%)	0.92	0.89	0.74	0.82	0.73	0.87	0.72			
Digestible His (%)	0.53	0.89	0.44	0.48	0.43	0.47	0.42			
<sup>1</sup> Control control dist I P10 & I										

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+EAAs10 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20

 $^{2}$ Vitamin premix provided the followings per kilogram of diet: vitamin A, 12000 IU, cholecalciferol, 5000 IU, vitamin E, 45 IU, vitamin K<sub>3</sub>, 2.4 mg, thiamine, 2.6 mg, riboflavin, 6.6 mg, pantothenic acid, 25 mg, niacin, 55 mg, choline chloride, 500 mg, biotin, 0.1 mg, folic acid, 1.5 mg, pyridoxine 5.5 mg, vitamin B<sub>12</sub>,0.015 mg, BHT, 1 mg,

<sup>3</sup>Mineral premix provide the followings per kilogram of diet: iron, 50 mg, zinc, 85 mg, manganese, 90 mg, iodine, 1 mg, copper, 10 mg, selenium, 0.25 mg. <sup>4</sup>Amino acid analysis was done by Degussa Evonik (Iran).

### **Digestible Nitogen determination**

Digestibility of CP was determined using the total collection method at the end of third and fifth weeks of age. Briefly, excreta were collected, and the related FI was recorded for the subsequent three days. The excreta were collected daily and frozen until drying at the end of

the experiment. Total nitrogen and dry matter of dried samples of the excreta and diets were determined.

#### Statistical analysis

Data were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance using the GLM procedure of SAS (SAS.,

<sup>170</sup> 

2010) as a completely randomized design. For performance traits, the pen was the experimental unit, whereas individual bird data were used for the weight of internal organs. The means were compared using the Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

## Results

## Growth performance

Data for growth performance are presented in Table 3. During 1-21 d of age, the reduction of CP significantly decreased BWG and impaired FCR (P <0.01). No differences were found in growth performance of the birds fed with control, LP10+EAAs10 and LP10+EAAs20 diets. Supplementation of the LP20 diet with 20% higher EAAs, significantly improved BWG and FCR, in comparison to the LP20 and LP20+EAAs10 ( $P \leq$ 0.0001), but were significantly less than control diet. Also, 20% EAAs supplementation of the LP10 diet significantly improved FCR in comparison to the LP10 diet ( $P \le 0.0001$ ). Different treatments had no significant effect on feed intake, but feed intake was

numerically the highest, for birds fed with LP10+EAAs10 diet. During 22 - 35 d of age, quails fed LP20 diet showed numerically higher BWG and FI than those fed other diets (P > 0.05). Also, FCR in the birds fed LP10, LP20, and LP20+EAAs10 diets were significantly better than the control (P < 0.01).

During the total rearing period (1-35 d), a 20% reduction of CP significantly decreased BWG in comparison to the control, LP10 +EAAs10 and LP10+EAAs20 groups (P < 0.01). Also, adding EAAs did not affect the LP20 group, but 20% EAAs supplementation of the LP10 diet significantly improved BWG in comparison to the LP10 diet (P < 0.01). Nevertheless, in the whole of the experiment, no differences were observed in FI and FCR between different dietary treatments. Furthermore, different dietary treatments did not affect livability at 21 and 35 d of age (P > 0.05).

In the total of the rearing period, enrichment of the diets with EAAs strongly increased feed cost per kg of live body gain, because some EAAs are very expensive.

<b>Table 3.</b> Growth performance of quails fed experimental diets from 1 to 35 d of age.
--

Variables $P_{control}$ LP10LP20LP10+LP20+LP10+LP10+LP20+P- value $SEM^2$ BWG (g/bird/d)1-21 d5.85a5.46bc5.31c5.83a5.43c5.91a5.61b0.00010.0522-35 d7.417.537.787.347.517.397.420.0640.091-35 d6.44ab6.34bc6.29c6.43ab6.26c6.52a6.29c0.00180.04FI (g/bird/d)II <th></th> <th></th> <th colspan="12">Treatments<sup>1</sup></th>			Treatments <sup>1</sup>											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Variables	Control	I D10	1 020	LP10+	LP20+	LP10+	LP20+		$SEM^2$				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Colluloi	LFIU	LF 20	EAAs10	EAAs10	EAAs20	EAAs20	value					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	BWG (g/bird/d)													
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1-21 d	5.85 <sup>a</sup>	5.46 <sup>bc</sup>	5.31 <sup>c</sup>	5.83 <sup>a</sup>	5.43°	5.91 <sup>a</sup>	5.61 <sup>b</sup>	0.0001	0.05				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	22-35 d	7.41	7.53	7.78	7.34	7.51	7.39	7.42	0.064	0.09				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1-35 d	6.44 <sup>ab</sup>	6.34 <sup>bc</sup>	6.29 <sup>c</sup>	6.43 <sup>ab</sup>	6.26 <sup>c</sup>	6.52 <sup>a</sup>	6.29 <sup>c</sup>	0.0018	0.04				
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	FI (g/bird/d)													
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1-21 d	12.47	12.34	12.45	12.85	12.72	12.77	12.68	0.238	0.14				
FCR         1-21 d         2.15 <sup>d</sup> 2.26 <sup>b</sup> 2.33 <sup>a</sup> 2.21 <sup>bc</sup> 2.33 <sup>a</sup> 2.17 <sup>dc</sup> 2.26 <sup>b</sup> 0.0001         0.01           22-35 d         3.39 <sup>ab</sup> 3.25 <sup>c</sup> 3.22 <sup>c</sup> 3.37 <sup>ab</sup> 3.25 <sup>c</sup> 3.41 <sup>a</sup> 3.28 <sup>bc</sup> 0.0031         0.03           1-35 d         2.72         2.73         2.75         2.72         2.76         2.75         2.73         0.378         0.02           Livability (%)         21 d         99.16         100.00         98.33         100.00         99.16         100.00         97.5         0.143         0.73           35 d         95.00         95.00         96.66         98.33         96.66         97.50         95.00         0.588         1.52	22-35 d	24.78	24.54	24.87	24.79	24.45	25.57	24.41	0.158	0.28				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1-35 d	17.54	17.22	17.47	17.50	17.33	17.94	17.28	0.084	0.15				
22-35 d         3.39 <sup>ab</sup> 3.25 <sup>c</sup> 3.22 <sup>c</sup> 3.37 <sup>ab</sup> 3.25 <sup>c</sup> 3.41 <sup>a</sup> 3.28 <sup>bc</sup> 0.0031         0.03           1-35 d         2.72         2.73         2.75         2.72         2.76         2.75         2.73         0.378         0.02           Livability (%)         21 d         99.16         100.00         98.33         100.00         99.16         100.00         97.5         0.143         0.73           35 d         95.00         95.00         96.66         98.33         96.66         97.50         95.00         0.588         1.52	FCR													
1-35 d         2.72         2.73         2.75         2.72         2.76         2.75         2.73         0.378         0.02           Livability (%)         21 d         99.16         100.00         98.33         100.00         99.16         100.00         97.5         0.143         0.73           35 d         95.00         95.00         96.66         98.33         96.66         97.50         95.00         0.588         1.52	1-21 d	2.15 <sup>d</sup>	2.26 <sup>b</sup>	2.33 <sup>a</sup>	2.21 <sup>bc</sup>	2.33 <sup>a</sup>	2.17 <sup>dc</sup>	2.26 <sup>b</sup>	0.0001	0.01				
Livability (%) 21 d 99.16 100.00 98.33 100.00 99.16 100.00 97.5 0.143 0.73 35 d 95.00 95.00 96.66 98.33 96.66 97.50 95.00 0.588 1.52	22-35 d	3.39 <sup>ab</sup>	3.25 <sup>c</sup>	3.22 <sup>c</sup>	3.37 <sup>ab</sup>	3.25°	3.41 <sup>a</sup>	3.28 <sup>bc</sup>	0.0031	0.03				
21 d99.16100.0098.33100.0099.16100.0097.50.1430.7335 d95.0095.0096.6698.3396.6697.5095.000.5881.52	1-35 d	2.72	2.73	2.75	2.72	2.76	2.75	2.73	0.378	0.02				
35 d 95.00 95.00 96.66 98.33 96.66 97.50 95.00 0.588 1.52	Livability (%)													
	21 d	99.16	100.00	98.33	100.00	99.16	100.00	97.5	0.143	0.73				
Feed cost: Rials/kg of BWG	35 d	95.00	95.00	96.66	98.33	96.66	97.50	95.00	0.588	1.52				
	Feed cost: Rials/k	kg of BWG												
1-35 d 113180 <sup>c</sup> 111130 <sup>c</sup> 106390 <sup>c</sup> 161580 <sup>b</sup> 162430 <sup>b</sup> 522830 <sup>a</sup> 460620 <sup>a</sup> 0.0001 205.2	1-35 d	113180 <sup>c</sup>	111130 <sup>c</sup>	106390°	161580 <sup>b</sup>	162430 <sup>b</sup>	522830 <sup>a</sup>	460620 <sup>a</sup>	0.0001	205.2				

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+EAAs100 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20.

Means with different superscripts within the same row differ significantly (P < 0.05). <sup>2</sup>Standard error of means.

## **Carcass traits**

The carcass characteristics results are depicted in Table 4. At 21 d of age, 10% amino acid supplementation of the LP10 diet significantly increased breast yield in comparison to the control, LP10, and LP20 diets (P < 0.05). The highest liver yield was also obtained with quails fed LP10 diet (P < 0.05). Quails fed LP20+EAAs10 diet had numerically higher abdominal fat yield (P > 0.05). At 35 d of age, dietary treatments had no significant effect on liver and breast yield (P > 0.05). Also, the

relative weight of the other parts, including thighs, proventriculus, gizzard, small intestine, heart, and abdominal fat of the birds at both of the growing periods were not affected by the dietary treatments (P > 0.05).

## Meat quality

Breast meat quality parameters for different groups are presented in Table 5. At 35 d of age, the meat pH of the birds fed with the control diet was significantly lower than the other treatments ( $P \le 0.0001$ ). Other

Archive of SID.ir

#### 172

parameters (cooking loss, dripping loss, and water holding capacity) were not affected by the dietary treatments at both periods.

#### Nitrogen retention

The effect of different dietary treatments on N balance is illustrated in Table 6. Different treatments affected N balance data. At 21 d of age, quails which

fed 20% CP diets, with and without EAAs supplementation (LP20, LP20+EAAs10, and LP20+EAAs20), had significantly lower N intake and N retention compared to those fed with the other diets (P < 0.01). N excretion was the lowest in quails fed LP10 and LP20 diets and was significantly different from control and LP10+EAAs20 (P < 0.01).

**Table 4.** Effects of different treatments on the relative weight of different carcass traits (% of live body weight) at 21 and 35 d of age.

			Treatments <sup>1</sup>									
Variables		Control	LP10	LP20	LP10+	LP20+	LP10+	LP20+	P-value	$SEM^2$		
		Control	LP10	LP20	EAAs10	EAAs10	EAAs20	EAAs20				
Carcass	21 d	56.7	56.5	56.2	57.2	56.7	56.8	57.5	0.476	0.74		
	35 d	65.0	63.9	64.5	64.7	64.3	64.6	64.9	0.725	0.81		
Breast	21 d	21.5 <sup>bc</sup>	21.5 <sup>bc</sup>	21.1°	22.9 <sup>a</sup>	21.8 <sup>abc</sup>	22.6 <sup>ab</sup>	21.9 <sup>abc</sup>	0.0164	0.52		
	35 d	25.7	24.9	25.7	26.3	25.9	26.6	25.8	0.094	0.52		
Thigh	21 d	13.8	13.3	13.1	13.4	13.6	13.2	13.5	0.136	0.23		
	35 d	14.5	15.1	14.6	14.5	14.9	14.5	15.1	0.165	0.33		
Liver	21 d	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	3.2ª	3.0 <sup>b</sup>	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.9 <sup>b</sup>	2.8 <sup>b</sup>	0.014	0.012		
	35 d	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	0.715	0.10		
Proventriculus	21 d	0.48	0.46	0.46	0.46	0.48	0.49	0.45	0.808	0.02		
	35 d	0.35	0.36	0.37	0.35	0.35	0.38	0.36	0.779	0.013		
Gizzard	21 d	3.13	3.04	2.89	2.82	3.09	3.05	2.95	0.439	0.11		
	35 d	2.52	2.38	2.55	2.4	2.45	2.37	2.35	0.566	0.088		
Heart	21 d	0.75	0.75	0.71	0.70	0.72	0.71	0.69	0.289	0.022		
	35 d	0.91	0.84	0.89	0.91	0.87	0.83	0.83	0.296	0.032		
Small intestine	21 d	4.78	4.80	4.94	4.94	4.72	4.98	4.72	0.949	0.214		
	35 d	2.94	3.11	3.01	3.07	2.76	3.12	2.9	0.474	0.13		
Abdominal fat	21 d	0.22	0.21	0.24	0.17	0.26	0.20	0.23	0.092	0.03		
	35 d	0.81	0.70	0.72	0.69	0.70	0.57	0.74	0.707	0.09		

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+EAAs10 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20.

<sup>2</sup>Standard error of means. Means with different superscripts within the same row differ significantly (P < 0.05)

**Table 5.** Effects of different treatments on breast meat quality in mixed-Japanese quails at 21 and 35 d of age<sup>1</sup>.

					Treatmen		*			<u> </u>
variables		Control	LP10	LP20	LP10+	LP20+	LP10+	LP20+	P-value	$SEM^2$
		Colluloi	LFIU	LF20	EAAs10	EAAs10	EAAs20	EAAs20		
лIJ	21 d	6.06	6.03	6.00	6.04	6.01	5.98	6.05	0.858	0.04
pH	35 d	5.89 <sup>b</sup>	6.04 <sup>a</sup>	6.05 <sup>a</sup>	6.10 <sup>a</sup>	6.04 <sup>a</sup>	6.01 <sup>a</sup>	6.06 <sup>a</sup>	0.0001	0.03
Water holding	21 d	73.9	76.2	73.9	68.4	73.1	75.5	76.5	0.403	2.7
capacity (%)	35 d	68.1	69.4	69.5	68.2	69.4	68.1	70.2	0.075	0.56
Cooking loss	21 d	22.2	23.1	22.9	23.9	23.4	24.3	21.9	0.569	0.93
(%)	35 d	24.0	21.1	22.9	21.7	23.7	22.8	21.6	0.348	1.01
Dripping loss	21 d	16.4	16.8	16.7	17.1	16.1	16.7	17.39	0.746	0.52
(%)	35 d	14.7	14.9	17.4	16.0	15.6	14.2	16.3	0.106	0.76

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+EAAs10 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20.

<sup>2</sup>Standard error of means. Means with different superscripts within the same row differ significantly (P < 0.05).

At 35 d of age, except for N excretion, other parameters were influenced by different dietary treatments. Quails fed with 17.6% CP diets, with and without EAAs supplementation (LP20, LP20+EAAs10, and LP20+EAAs20), had significantly lower N retention in comparison to those fed control, LP10, and also LP10+EAAs20 diets (P<0.01). In both ages, the highest N retention was obtained in quails fed LP10 diets. At 21 and 35 d of age, the lowest N retention was obtained in quails fed LP20+EAAs10 and LP20 diets, respectively.

Table 6. Effects of different treatments on nitrogen retention in mixed-Japanese quails at 21 and 35 d of age.

		P-							
Variables	Control	LP10	LP20	LP10+	LP20+	LP10+	LP20+	value	$SEM^2$
variables	Control	LFIU	LF 20	EAAs10	EAAs10	EAAs20	EAAs20	value	
21 days									
N intake (g/bird/day)	0.68 <sup>ab</sup>	0.62 <sup>bc</sup>	0.58°	$0.68^{ab}$	0.59°	0.71ª	0.60 <sup>c</sup>	0.0001	0.018
N excreted (g/bird/day)	$0.40^{ab}$	0.34 <sup>c</sup>	0.34 <sup>c</sup>	0.37 <sup>bc</sup>	0.37 <sup>bc</sup>	0.41 <sup>a</sup>	0.35°	0.0014	0.012
N retention(g/bird/day)	0.29 <sup>a</sup>	0.29 <sup>a</sup>	0.22 <sup>b</sup>	0.30 <sup>a</sup>	0.22 <sup>b</sup>	0.30 <sup>a</sup>	0.24 <sup>b</sup>	0.0001	0.012
N retention (% of N	42.89 <sup>bc</sup>	46.76 <sup>a</sup>	39.41 <sup>cd</sup>	45.12 <sup>ab</sup>	37.29 <sup>d</sup>	41.83 <sup>bc</sup>	40.82 <sup>cd</sup>	0.0001	1.20
intake)	42.07	40.70	37.41	45.12	51.2)	41.05	40.82	0.0001	1.20
35 days	_								
N intake (g/bird/day)	0.98 <sup>a</sup>	0.91 <sup>b</sup>	0.79 <sup>cd</sup>	0.84 <sup>bc</sup>	0.76 <sup>d</sup>	$0.92^{ab}$	0.81 <sup>cd</sup>	.0001	0.023
N excreted (g/bird/day)	0.56	0.50	0.51	0.49	0.48	0.52	0.50	0.163	0.019
N retention (g/bird/day)	0.42 <sup>a</sup>	$0.40^{ab}$	0.29 <sup>d</sup>	0.36 <sup>bc</sup>	0.28 <sup>d</sup>	$0.40^{ab}$	0.31 <sup>cd</sup>	0.0001	0.007
N retention (% of N	42.62 <sup>ab</sup>	44.67 <sup>a</sup>	38.16 <sup>c</sup>	42.50 <sup>ab</sup>	38.59°	43.71ª	40.05 <sup>bc</sup>	0.0011	1.08
intake)	.2.02		20.10	.2.30	20.07	.2.71		0.0011	1.50

<sup>1</sup>Control, control diet, LP10 & LP20, containing 10 and 20% lower CP than control diet, respectively, LP10+EAAs10 & LP20+EAAs10, containing 10% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20, LP10+EAAs20 & LP20+EAAs20, containing 20% higher EAAs than LP10 & LP20.

<sup>2</sup>Standard error of means. Means with different superscripts within the same row differ significantly (P < 0.05).

### Discussion

During the first phase (1-21 d), CP reduction from 25 to 22.5 and 20% significantly decreased daily BWG and increased FCR, whereas adding amino acids to the diet containing 22.5% CP (LP10+EAAs10 and LP10+EAAs20 diets) improved daily BWG and FCR. The results are in line with an earlier study (Kaur et al., 2008). Also, Miranda et al. (2015) reported decreasing of dietary CP from 24.87 to 22.4% and EAAs supplementation reduced performance in broilers during 1-21 d of age. But, interestingly during the second feeding phase (22-35 d), the daily BWG of chicks fed low CP diets without EAAs supplementation (LP10 and LP20 diets) was more than those fed with the control, LP10+EAAs10 and LP10+EAAs20 diets, even though it was not significant. Because of the compensatory growth, FCR was improved in this period that was in agreement with the results documented by Ali et al. (2000) with growing Japanese quails. The degree of compensatory growth response should be related to the severity of amino acid restriction. Another study also showed that feeding broiler chicks by low CP diets supplemented with various combinations of EAAs and nonessential amino acids decreased BWG from 7 to 21 d of age, but not from 21 to 42 d of age (Deschepper and De Groote, 1995). Such et al. (2021) reported growth performance of broilers fed with low-protein amino acid-supplemented diet (18.38% CP) was similar to those fed with control diet (20.43% CP) during 11 to 40 d of age.

During the whole rearing period (1-35 d), 10% reduction of CP, without EAAs supplementation, had no significant effect on daily BWG and other performance indices, but 20% CP reduction, without EAAs supplementation, significantly reduced daily BWG, and EAAs supplementation did not improve it. Chrystal *et al.* (2019) attributed these observations to

a possible deficiency of amino acids such as serine and glycine in diets with lower crude protein. That small reduction in dietary CP has a little effect on performance has been shown by others (Hernández *et al.*, 2012; Miranda *et al.*, 2015; Chrystal *et al.*, 2019). As dietary levels of CP are further reduced, another EAA becomes limiting and result in reduced performance (Hernández *et al.*, 2012; Belloir *et al.*, 2017; Chrystal *et al.*, 2019). Dean *et al.* (2006) observed that even with supplementation of EAAs, much lower dietary protein may cause a proportion of the EAAs being diverted to form NEAAs because of the lack of nonspecific nitrogen that would be used in this process.

Overall, many researchers noted that decreasing the CP content in poultry diets, and supplementing them with essential amino acids had a positive effect on bird performance (Manoochehri Ardekani et al., 2012; Ayasan and Okan, 2014; Belloir et al., 2017; Saraiva et al., 2020). Several studies also demonstrated that birds fed low CP amino acid supplemented diets didn't perform as well as those fed higher CP diets (Azarnik et al., 2010; Nukreaw and Banchasak, 2015; Basavanta Kumar et al., 2016). Even so, the information on the optimal protein level for growing quail is still finite. Minoguchi et al. (2001) and Alagawany et al. (2008) showed that it's possible to decrease the CP level, up to 22% in Japanese quail rations during the growing phase, without any negative effect on growth performance. Wen *et al.* (2017) remarked that with supplementation of crystalline amino acids, it is feasible to formulate the low-protein diets comprising about 22% CP without any adverse effect on growth performance and carcass traits of quails. Santos et al. (2016) also demonstrated that reducing dietary CP from 20 to 16% together with EAAs supplementation did not affect laying performance and egg quality in



quails. The reason for the difference between these results is not entirely clear, but may be due to the supplementation of the low CP diets with specific amino acids. Diversity in the amount of protein, amino acids fortification, employed ingredients, bird's age, and strain may have contributed to some of the differences in outlined performance (Abudabos and Aljumaah, 2012). In our study, the effect of dietary protein and amino acid levels on livability percentage of quails was not significant that was in line with the other reports (Lima *et al.*, 2015; Nukreaw and Banchasak, 2015).

In the present study, there was no effects of dietary treatments on carcass yield at 21 and 35 d of age that coincided with those observed by Aboul-Ela et al. (2004) and Alagawany et al. (2014). At 21 d of age, the breast yield in the birds fed 22.5% CP diet containing 10% higher EAAs (LP10+EAAs10 diet) was the highest and significantly more than those fed with the control diet. Our findings are in good agreement with Abudabos and Aljumaah (2012), who reported broilers fed low protein diets (19.5% CP) supplemented with EAAs had significantly heavier breasts in comparison to the birds fed with the control diet (21% CP) from 12 to 33 d of age. These authors clarified that one of the reasons could be the greater supply of limiting amino acids, such as lysine and methionine in these diets.

At 35 d of age, there was no significant differences regarding the relative weight of the breast and other carcass parameters between quails fed different dietary treatments. Although, there is a dearth of information on the influence of low-CP diets and various dietary EAAs supplementation levels on carcass characteristics in growing quails, many studies have been published dealing with carcass quality in broiler chickens fed low-CP diets (Miranda et al., 2015; Basavanta Kumar et al., 2016; Saraiva et al., 2020). For instance, Saleh et al. (2021) exhibited lowering CP by 2% and EAAs supplementation had no significant effect on the carcass, breast and thigh yield in broilers which was in line with Miranda et al. (2015). These authors reported that reducing dietary CP and EAAs supplementation had no significant effect on breast meat yield and abdominal fat in broilers at 42 d of age. On the contrary, Dehghani-Tafti and Jahanian (2016) observed reduced carcass and breast yields in broilers fed low protein diets; however, the proportion of abdominal fat was increased with low protein diets. Belloir et al. (2017) reported that reduction of dietary CP and EAAs supplementation did not affect breast meat yield, but, abdominal fat percentage was increased by the reduction of dietary CP content. Similarly, Manoochehri Ardekani et al. (2012) reported that reducing dietary protein from 20 to 16% in broiler diets supplemented with synthetic EAAs, significantly increased abdominal fat, but the

relative weight of liver, breast, and thigh was not affected by dietary treatments. In our study, lack of a significant effect in FI and FCR between different dietary treatments in total of the rearing period can be partly explained the reason for not affecting abdominal fat. These disagreements among authors might be clarified by many factors such as strain, physiological conditions, age, and production cycle of the birds, diversity in the amount of protein, and amino acid fortification which may influence the efficacy of various low-CP diets supplemented by essential amino acids.

In our study, the relative weight of the liver enhanced in low-CP diets. Wen *et al.* (2017) mentioned that dietary CP reduction from 25.32 to 21.58% and EAAs supplementation increased liver weight in French quails at 42 d of age. It seems, elevated blood ammonia level causes the conversion of ammonia to uric acid in the liver. Hence, this weight enhancement might be attributed to the accommodation to raised ammonia production (Darsi *et al.*, 2012). Likewise, the low body weight could be related somewhat to the increasing activity of urea cycle enzymes. It is believed that raising activities of the enzymes involved in uric acid production influences the growth performance (Namroud *et al.*, 2008; Darsi *et al.*, 2012).

In the present study, dietary treatments had no significant effect on meat quality indices, except for pH. The meat pH in the birds fed with the control diet was significantly lower than the other treatments. Belloir et al. (2017) reported reduction of dietary CP from 19 to 16% and EAAs supplementation in broiler diets caused an increase in ultimate pH and a decrease in breast meat dripping loss. Also, Jlali et al. (2012) reported reduction of dietary CP from 23 to 17%, and EAAs supplementation increased pH and WHC of breast meat in broilers. Lilly et al. (2011) indicated that different dietary densities of EAAs had no significant effect on cooking loss of broilers breast meat at 42 d of age. On the contrary, Gheisari et al. (2015) showed that reduction of dietary CP and EAAs supplementation decreased pH of broilers at 42 d of age. Also, no effect on WHC were detected. Also, Tarasewicz et al. (2007) reported that feeding quails with a low crude protein diet and providing a similar level of methionine and lysine did not affect pH and cooking loss but increased WHC of breast meat. Different researches have shown that the final pH responds to rearing management, age, preslaughter conditions, dietary treatments and especially to variation in methionine, lysine or protein in diet. (Berri et al., 2008; Jaturasitha et al., 2008; Jlali et al., 2012; Conde-Aguilera et al., 2016). Duclos et al. (2007) and Berri et al. (2008) showed that muscle glycogen stores at the time of death, negatively affect the final pH. Moreover, with increase in muscle yield and weight, glycogen levels



of breast muscle decrease (Berri *et al.*, 2007). These alterations cause higher pH and WHC of breast meat (Zhang and Barbut, 2005; Albrecht *et al.*, 2019).

According to the results, a 10% reduction in dietary CP decreased N intake and N excreted but had no effect on N retention (g/bird/d). However, a 20% reduction in dietary CP caused a significant reduction in N intake, N excreted and N retention (g/bird/d) at 21 d of age. Similarly, Kerr and Kidd (1999) reported that reduction in dietary CP from 19.4 to 18.2% decreased daily N consumption by broilers with no effect on g N retained/bird/day. Nevertheless, reduction in dietary CP level from 19.4% to 16.7% decreased daily intake of N and g N retained/bird/day. At 35 d of age, except for quails fed LP20+EAAs10 diet, supplementation of the low CP diets had no significant effect on N excretion and N retention percentage compared to the birds fed the control diet. In this respect, Kaur et al. (2008) stated that quails fed low-protein diets (20.66% CP) supplemented with EAAs grew slower and retained less N than birds fed with the control diet (25.75% CP). The main event of the improvement of N retention was the decrease in N excretion as shown in Table 6. Reduction of dietary CP up to 10 and 20% decreased N excretion on average 10 and 12.5%, Similarly, Kaur et al. (2008) and respectively. Mosaad and Iben (2009) remarked that N retention percentage was significantly higher in growing Japanese quails that fed the high protein diet than those fed the low protein diet. Contrariwise, Dowarah and Sethi (2014) reported that raising dietary protein content from 20 to 24% in Japanese quails

### References

- Aboul-Ela SS, El-Hindawy MM, Attia AI & Ashour AE. 2004. Protein and energy requirements of Japanese quail under Egyptian conditions 1-winter season. Zagazig Journal of Agriculture Research, 31: 1045-1073.
- Abudabos A & Aljumaah R. 2012. Broiler responses to reduced protein and energy diets supplemented with lysine, methionine, and threonine. Journal of Poultry Science, 49: 101-105. DOI: 10.2141/ jpsa.011058
- Alagawany M, Sonbol SM, El-Hendawy MM & Attia AI. 2008. Effect of protein and lysine levels on performance of growing Japanese quail. Zagazig Veterinary Journal, 36: 11-19.
- Alagawany M, El-Hindawy MM & Attia AI. 2014. Impact of protein and certain amino acids levels on performance of growing Japanese quails. Universal Journal of Applied Science, 2: 105-110. DOI: 10.13189/ujas.2014.020601
- Albrecht A, Hebel M, Heinemann C, Herbert U, Miskel D, Saremi B & Kreyenschmidt J. 2019. Assessment of meat quality and shelf life from

significantly decreased N retention at 35 d of age. Kriseldi *et al.* (2018) found that reduction in dietary CP and EAAs supplementation decreased N excretion in broilers in comparison to chicks fed with low dietary CP without EAAs supplementation. In our experiment, these effects were not constant. Eventually, our findings regarding N excretion and N retention well-nigh accommodate to those previously pointed out by other researchers (Dozier *et al.*, 2008; Santos *et al.*, 2016; Ullrich *et al.*, 2018). These authors believe that a suitable strategy to reduce N excretion in poultry farms is reducing the CP level of diet and supplementing with crystalline amino acids.

### Conclusion

The findings of this study indicated that a 10% reduction in dietary CP without EAAs supplementation had no adverse effect on the growth performance of Japanese quails during 1 to 35 d of age. Also, at 35 d of age, meat pH of the birds fed with the control diet was significantly lower than the other treatments. EAAs supplementation of low crude protein diets could improve growth performance and reduce environmental pollution, due to reduced N excretion. However, the high cost of some EAAs (e.g., isoleucine and valine) is the main limiting factor in formulating synthetic amino acid-containing diets.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge Kerman University for financial support and also Degussa Evonik (Iran) for amino acid analysis of the feed components.

broilers fed with different sources and concentrations of methionine. Journal of Food Quality,14: 174-183. DOI: 10.1155/2019/6182580

- Ali AM, El-Nagmy KY & Abd- Alsamea MO. 2000. The effect of dietary protein and yeast culture levels on performance of growing Japanese quails. Egyptian Poultry Science Journal, 20: 777-787.
- Ayasan T, Okan F & Hizli H. 2009. Threonine requirement of broilers from 22 to 42 days. International Journal of Poultry Science, 8: 862-865. DOI: 10.3923/ijps.2009.862.865
- Ayasan T & Okan F. 2010. Effects of diets containing different levels of threonine and lysine amino acids on fattening performance of broiler chicks. Journal of Faculty Agriculture Suleyman Demirel University. 5: 36-43. DOI: 10.3382/jfasdu.2010-00499
- Ayasan T & Okan F. 2014. The effect of choice feeding based on threonine on performance characteristics and carcass parameters of female broiler chicks. KSU Journal of Natural Sciences, 17: 1-9. DOI: 10.24925/turjaf. v2i4.190-196.117

Archive of SID.ir

- Azarnik A, Bokarpour M, Eslami M, Ghorbani MR & Mirzadeh K. 2010. The effect of different levels of diet protein on broilers performance in ad libitum and feed restriction method. Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances, 9: 631-634. DOI: 10.3923/javaa.2010.631.634
- Baker DH. 2009. Advances in protein- amino acid nutrition of poultry. Amino Acids, 37: 29-41. DOI: 10.1007/s00726-008-0198-3
- Baldini JT, Roberts RE & Kirkpatrick CM. 1995. A study of the protein requirements of bobwhite quail reared in confinement in battery brooders to 8 weeks of age. Poultry Science, 29: 161–166. DOI: 10.3382/ps.0290161
- Basavanta Kumar C, Gloridoss RG, Singh KC, Prabhu TM & Suresh BN. 2016. Performance of broiler chickens fed low protein, limiting amino acid supplemented diets formulated either on total or standardized ileal digestible amino acid basis. Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences, 29: 1616-1624. DOI: 10.5713/ajas.15.0648
- Belloir P, Méda B, Lambert W, Corrent E, Juin H, Lessire M & Tesseraud S. 2017. Reducing the CP content in broiler feeds: impact on animal performance, meat quality, and nitrogen utilization. Animal, 11: 1881–1889. DOI: 10.1017/S1751731117000660
- Berri C, Le Bihan-Duval E, Debut M, Sante'-Lhoutellier V, Bae'za E, Gigaud V, Je'go Y & Duclos MJ. 2007. Consequence of muscle hypertrophy on Pectoralis major characteristics and breast meat quality of broiler chickens. Journal of Animal Science, 85: 2005–2011. DOI: 10.2527/jas.2006-398
- Berri C, Besnard J & Relandeau C. 2008. Increasing dietary lysine increases final pH and decreases drip loss of broiler breast meat. Poultry Science, 87: 480-484. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2007-00226
- Bertrama HC, Andersena HJ, Karlssona AH, Hornc P, Hedegaardc J, Norgaardb L & Engelsenb SB. 2003. Prediction of technological quality (cooking loss and napole yield) of pork based on fresh meat characteristics. Meat Science, 65: 707–712. DOI: 10.1016/S0309-1740(02)00272-3
- Castellini C, Mugnai C & Dal Bosco A. 2002. Effect of organic production system on broiler carcass and meat quality. Meat Science, 60: 219–225. DOI: 10.1016/S0309-1740(01)00124-3
- Christensen LB. 2003. Drip loss sampling in porcine m. longissimus dorsi. Meat Science, 63: 469–477. DOI: 10.1016/S0309-1740(02)00106-7
- Chrystal PV, Moss AF, Khoddami A, Naranjo VD, Selle PH & Liu SY. 2019. Impacts of reducedcrude protein diets on key parameters in male broiler chickens offered maize-based diets. Poultry Science, 99: 505–516. DOI: 10.3382/ ps/pez573

- Conde-Aguilera JA, Cholet JCG, Lessire M, Mercier Y, Tesseraud S & van Milgen J. 2016. The level and source of free-methionine affect body composition and breast muscle traits in growing broilers. Poultry Science, 95: 2322–2331. DOI: 10.3382/ps/pew105
- Darsi E, Shivazad M, Zaghari M, Namroud NF & Mohammadi R. 2012. Effect of reduced dietary crude protein levels on growth performance, plasma uric acid and electrolyte concentration of male broiler chicks. Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology, 14: 789-797. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2007-00499
- Dean DW, Bidner TD & Southern LL. 2006. Glycine supplementa tion to low protein, amino acid supplemented diets support optimal performance of broiler chicks. Poultry Science, 85: 288-96. DOI: 10.1093/ps/85.2.288
- Dehghani-Tafti N & Jahanian R. 2016. Effect of supplemental organic acids on performance, carcass characteristics, and serum biochemical metabolites in broilers fed diets containing different crude protein levels. Animal Feed Science and Technology, 211: 109-116. DOI: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2015.09.019
- Deschepper K & De Groote G. 1995. Effect of dietary protein, essential and non-essential amino acids on the performance and carcass composition of male broiler chickens. British Poultry Science, 36: 229–245. DOI: 10.1080/00071669508417772
- Dowarah R & Sethi APS. 2014. Various dietary levels of protein and energy interaction on growth performance of white plumage Japanese quails. Veterinary World, 7(6): 398-402. DOI: 10.14202/ vetworld.2014
- Dozier WA, Corzo A, Kidd MT & Schilling MW. 2008. Dietary digestible lysine requirements of male and female broilers from forty-nine to sixtythree days of age. Poultry Science, 87: 1385-1391. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2007-00529
- Duclos MJ, Berri C & Le Bihan-Duval E. 2007. Muscle growth and meat quality. Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 16: 107–112. DOI: 10.1093/japr/16.1.107
- Gheisari A, Assai K, Mostafa I & Mohsenifard E. 2015. Effect of different levels of dietary crude protein on growth performance, body composition of broiler chicken and low protein diet in broiler chicken. International Journal of Poultry Science, 14: 285-292. DOI: 10.3923/ijps.2015.285.292
- Hernández F, López M, Martínez S, Megías MD, Catalá P & Madrid J. 2012. Effect of low-protein diets and single sex on production performance, plasma metabolites, digestibility, and nitrogen excretion in 1- to 48-day-old broilers. Poultry Science, 91 :683–692. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2011-01735

Poultry Science Journal 2021, 9(2): 167-178

- Jang A, Liu XD, Shin MH, Lee BD, Lee SK, Lee JH & Jo C. 2008. Antioxidative potential of raw breast meat from broiler chicks fed a dietary medicinal herb extract mix. Poultry Science, 87: 2382-2389. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2007-00506
- Jaturasitha S, Srikanchai T, Kreuzer M & Wicke M. 2008. Differences in carcass and meat characteristics between chicken indigenous to Northern Thailand, Black-Boned and Thai Native and imported extensive breeds, Bresse and Rhode Island Red. Poultry Science, 87: 160-169. DOI: 10.3382/ps.2006-00398
- Jlali M, Gigaud V, Métayer-Coustard S, Sellier N, Tesseraud S, Le Bihan-Duval E & Berri C. 2012. Modulation of glycogen and breast meat processing ability by nutrition in chickens: Effect of crude protein level in 2 chicken genotypes. Journal of Animal Science, 90: 447-455. DOI: 10.2527/jas.2011-4405
- Kaur S, Mandal AB, Singh KB & Kadam MM. 2008. The response of Japanese quails (heavy body weight line) to dietary energy levels and graded essential amino acid levels on growth performance and immuno-competence. Livestock Science, 117: 255-262. DOI: 10.1016/j.livsci. 2007.12.019
- Kerr B & Kidd M. 1999. Amino acid supplementation of low protein broiler diets: 2. Formulation on an ideal amino acid basis. Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 8: 310–320. DOI: 10.1093/japr/8.3.310
- Kriseldi R, Tillman PB, Jiang Z & Dozier WA. 2018. Effects of feeding reduced crude protein diets on growth performance, nitrogen excretion, and plasma uric acid concentration of broiler chicks during the starter period. Poultry Science, 97: 1614–1626. DOI: 10.3382/ps/pex395
- Lemme A. 2003. The ideal protein concept in broiler nutrition 1. Methodological aspects–Opportunities and limitations. Degussa AG Amino News, 4: 7-14.
- Lilly RA, Schilling MW, Silva JL, Martin JM & Corzo A. 2011. The effects of dietary amino acid density in broiler feed on carcass characteristics and meat quality. Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 20: 56–67. DOI: 10.3382/japr.2010-00222
- Lima HJDA, Bareto SLT, Donzele JL, Tinoco IFT, Natália S & Ribas N. 2015. Ideal ratio of digestible methionine plus cystine to digestible lysine for growing Japanese quails. Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias, 28: 313-322. DOI: 10.17533/udea.rccp.v28n4a03
- Lima HJD, Barreto SLT, Donzele JL, Souza GS, Almeida RL, Tinoco IFF & Albino LFT. 2016. Digestible lysine requirement for growing Japanese quails. Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 25: 483-491. DOI: 10.3382/japr/pfw030

Poultry Science Journal 2021, 9(2): 167-178

- Liu SU, Macelline SP, Chrystal PV & Selle PH. 2021. Progress towards reduced-crude protein diets for broiler chickens and sustainable chickenmeat production. Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology, 12: 20-32. DOI: 10.1186/s40104-021-00550-w
- Manoochehri Ardekani H, Shevazad M, Chamani M, Aminafshar M & Darsi Arani E. 2012. The effect of L-carnitine and low crude protein supplemented with crystalline essential amino acids diets on broiler chickens. Annals of Biological Research, 3: 1085-1093.
- Minoguchi N, Ohguchi H, Yamamoto R & Hanaki Y. 2001. Low protein diets for Japanese quail and the reduction in nitrogen excretion. Research bulletin of the Aichi-ken. Agricultural Research Center, 33: 319-324.
- Miranda DJA, Vieira SL, Favero A, Angel CR & Stefanello C. 2015. Performance and meat production of broiler chickens fed diets formulated at different crude protein levels supplemented or not with L-valine and Lisoleucine. Animal Feed Science and Technology, 206: 39-47. DOI: 10.1016/j.anifeedsci. 2015.04.018
- Mosaad GMM & Iben C. 2009. Effect of dietary energy and protein levels on growth performance, carcass yield, and some blood constituents of Japanese quails (Coturnixc oturnix Japonica). Die Bodenkultur, 60: 39-46.
- Namroud NF, Shivazad M & Zaghari M. 2008. Effects of fortifying low crude protein diet with crystalline amino acids on performance, blood ammonia level, and excreta characteristics of broiler chicks. Poultry Science, 87: 2250-2258. DOI: 10/3382/ps.2007-00499.
- NRC (National Research Council). 1994. Nutrient requirements of poultry. 9th Rev. Ed. National Academy Press. Washington, DC. 176 Pages.
- Nukreaw R & Banchasak C. 2015. Effect of supplementing synthetic amino acids in lowprotein diet and subsequent re-feeding on growth performance, serum lipid profile and chemical body composition of broiler chickens. Journal of Poultry Science 52: 127-136. DOI:10.2141/ jpsa.0140102
- Perry TW, Cullison AE &, Lowrey RS. 2004. Feeds and feeding. 6th ed. Pearson Education, Inc. Upper Saddle River, New Jersy.
- Rostagno HS, Albino LFT, Donzele JL, Gomes PC, Oliveira RF, Lopes DC, Ferreira AS, Barreto SLT & Euclides RF. 2011. Tabelas Brasileiraspara Aves e Suinos: Composição de Alimentos e Exigências Nutricionais. Viçosa Publishers.
- Saleh AA, Amber KA, Soliman MM, Soliman MY, Morsy WA, Shukry M & Alzawqari MH. 2021. Effect of low protein diets with amino acids supplementation on growth performance, carcass

178

traits, blood parameters and muscle amino acids profile in broiler chickens under high ambient temperature. Agriculture, 11: 185-197 DOI: 10.3390/agriculture11020185

- Santos GC, Garcia EA, Filho JAV, Molino AB, Pelicia K & Berto DA. 2016. Performance of Japanese quails fed diets with low-protein and isoleucine. Acta Scientiarum, 38: 219-225. DOI: 10.4025/actascianimsci. v38i2.29533
- Saraiva EP, Silva JHV, Costa FGP, Santos NR, Fonsêca VFC, Santos SGCG, Cavalcante DTC, Magalhães TS & Santos JDC. 2020. Effect of nutrition plane on meat quail kept in thermoneutral environment: performance and carcass characteristics. The Journal of Agricultural Science, 157: 749-754. DOI: 10.1017/ S0021859620000167
- SAS. Inc. 2010. SAS Online Doc® Version 9.1.3. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA.
- Shrivastava AK & Panda BA. 1999. review of quail nutrition research in India. World Poultry Science Journal, 55: 73–81. DOI: 10.1079/WPS19990006
- Si J, Fritts CA, Burnham DJ & Waldroup PW. 2004. Extent to which crude protein may be reduced in corn-soybean meal broiler diets through amino acid supplementation. International Journal of Poultry Science, 3: 46–50. DOI: 10.3923/ijps. 2004.46.50
- Silva JHV & Costa FGP. 2009. Tabela Para Codornas Japonesas e européias. 2nd ed. Jaboticabal, SP: FUNEP,110 Pages.
- Such N, Pál L, Strifler P, Horváth B, Koltay IA, Rawash MA, Farkas V, laki AM, Wágner L & Dublecz K. 2021. Effect of feeding low protein diets on the production traits and the nitrogen

composition of excreta of broiler chickens. Agriculture, 11: 781-789. DOI. 10.3390/ agriculture11080781

- Taheri HR & Alvani S. 2020. Effect of Protein and Energy-reduced or Protein-reduced Diet on Mortality and Performance of Broiler Chickens Reared at a High-altitude Area. Poultry Science Journal, 8: 129-133. DOI: 10.22069/psj.2020. 17492.1537
- Tarasewicz Z, Ligocki M, Szczerbinska D, Majewska D & Danczak A. 2007. Different level of crude protein and energy – protein ratio in adult quail diets. Archiv fur Tierzucht, 50: 520-530. DOI: 10.5194/aab-50-520-2007
- Ullrich C, Langeheine M, Brehm R, Taube V, Siebert D & Visscher C. 2018. Influence of reduced protein content in complete diets with a consistent arginine–lysine ratio on performance and nitrogen excretion in broilers. Sustainability, 10: 3827-3839. DOI:10.3390/su10113827
- Vieira SL & Angel CR. 2010. Optimizing broiler performance using different amino acid density diets: What are the limits? Journal of Applied Poultry Research, 21: 149-155. DOI: 10.3382/ japr.2011-00476
- Wen ZG, Du YK, Xie M, Li XM, Wang JD & Yang PL. 2017. Effects of low-protein diets on growth performance and carcass yields of growing French meat quails (France Coturnixcoturnix). Poultry Science, 96: 1364-1369. DOI: 10.3382/ps/pew321
- Zhang L & Barbut S. 2005. Rheological characteristics of fresh and frozen PSE, normal and DFD chicken breast meat. British Poultry Science, 46: 687–693. DOI: 10.1080/00071660 500391516

